1 2

### 3

### 4

## 5

### 7

## 8

#### 10

11

12

13 14

1516

17

18 19

20

2122

2324

25

26

27

28

# UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT DISTRICT OF NEVADA

\* \* \*

James Scott Alva,

Plaintiff,

v.

Lew Lewisburg USP, et al.,

Defendants.

Case No. 2:24-cv-00072-CDS-DJA

**Report and Recommendation** 

On October 22, 2024, the Court denied Plaintiff's application to proceed in forma pauperis and gave him until November 21, 2024, to file a complete one. (ECF No. 11). In that order, the Court warned Plaintiff that "failure to comply with this order will result in a recommendation to the District Judge that this action be dismissed." (*Id.*). When Plaintiff missed that deadline, the Court entered an order to show cause why the Court should not recommend dismissal of the action. (ECF No. 12). In doing so, the Court gave Plaintiff until January 8, 2025, to respond to the order and explained that "[f]ailure to comply with this order will result in the recommended dismissal of this action." (*Id.*). Plaintiff has missed that deadline and, to date, has not filed anything further on the docket. Accordingly, the Court recommends dismissal of this case without prejudice. A dismissal without prejudice allows Plaintiff to refile a case with the Court, under a new case number.

Accordingly, the undersigned **RECOMMENDS** that this case be **DISMISSED** without prejudice. The Clerk of Court is kindly directed to send this recommendation to Plaintiff.

#### **NOTICE**

Pursuant to Local Rule IB 3-2 any objection to this Report and Recommendation must be in writing and filed with the Clerk of the Court within (14) days after service of this Notice. The

#### Case 2:24-cv-00072-APG-DJA Document 13 Filed 01/27/25 Page 2 of 2

Supreme Court has held that the courts of appeal may determine that an appeal has been waived due to the failure to file objections within the specified time. *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 142 (1985), *reh'g denied*, 474 U.S. 1111 (1986). The Ninth Circuit has also held that (1) failure to file objections within the specified time and (2) failure to properly address and brief the objectionable issues waives the right to appeal the District Court's order and/or appeal factual issues from the order of the District Court. *Martinez v. Ylst*, 951 F.2d 1153, 1157 (9th Cir. 1991); *Britt v. Simi Valley United Sch. Dist.*, 708 F.2d 452, 454 (9th Cir. 1983).

DATED: January 27, 2025

DANIEL J. ALBREGTS

UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE